

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/942,168

Applicant(s)

Liu et al.

Examiner

Scott T. Baderman

Group Art Unit

2184

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Scott T. Baderman

(3) _____

(2) Eric Nelson (Reg. #43,829)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 3, 2000Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 1, 24, 30, 35, and 41

Identification of prior art discussed:

Lidgett et al. (5,768,496)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

With respect to the claims mentioned above, it was discussed whether the Lidgett et al. reference taught an "independently functional system recorder" as is claimed in all of the claims above (which are all independent). The last Office action (paper # 20) cited Lidgett et al. as teaching this limitation. It was further discussed that the claimed "system recorder" is actually a make-up of dedicated and independent microcontrollers, as was discussed in the response filed March 20, 2000, and is not merely a "non-volatile" memory (e.g., an EEPROM) as is taught by Lidgett et al. Further, it was discussed that the claimed "system log" (which is actually a NVRAM) further distinguished the "system recorder" from being a mere "non-volatile" memory. After reviewing Lidgett et al. and the last Office action, the Examiner agreed that Lidgett et al. does not teach this limitation, therefore allowing all of the independent claims to overcome the latest rejection. This being the case, it was agreed that this "Interview Summary" would act as the "response" to the last Office action (paper #20), and no further response is necessary.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.



Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.